

The Republican.

No. 9, VOL. 9.] LONDON, Friday, Feb. 27, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

REPUBLICANISM respects no *order* but that which carries with it the greatest amount of utility. The usual mode of editing is, to put notes to correspondents at the end of a publication; and it is not *unusual* to lie upon this subject, particularly at the commencement of a publication, by setting forth correspondences upon various subjects that have passed between *the Editor and himself*; writing to and answering himself, or pretending to answer matters of enquiry and observation which have never been made to him. The JOHN BULL and the REAL JOHN BULL Newspapers have been conspicuous in this sort of tittle tattle, this fraud upon the reader: and wherever a long string of curious notes to correspondents is seen, the reader may be assured that the one half of it is trick. The Editor of the Spectator was among the first to begin this sort of game; but his object was chaste, and the purpose useful: it was meant to reform bad habits and manners, which could not have been so well reached by other means.

I find, that I am getting out of order; but whether usefully or not, I must leave the reader to say: when I began, I meant to tell him, that I have deviated from the usual mode, and have made my notes to correspondents a leader; because, I have not room, in this No., to write upon any other subject; being desirous of working up some pieces of correspondence that have long been with the printer, waiting their turn; and to clear up all cause of complaint with correspondents, to whom, I acknowledge, that I am ungracious, though not unthankful, for the assistance which I receive from them. There is nothing I dislike to see in this publication, so much as notes to correspondents. I began it with this spirit, and gave notice, that no notice would be taken of documents sent and not accepted for printing. The motive for this rule was, that I then, as now, desired to make the

publication *useful*; to pay more attention to *utility* than to any other end. How far I have gone on upon this subject, I leave the reader to say, who has followed me; and again renew my pledge, that I shall not deal much with notes to correspondents; but, whatever is thought good and useful, shall find both impartiality and attention.

Having recovered from this second wandering, I have to announce, that I clear the way, as far as possible, this week, and hope to do justice to J. E. C. who has challenged me so to do, by assuring him, that his articles were sent to the press immediately on the receipt of the third; that I may print LORD BYRON'S "VISION OF JUDGMENT" in No. 10.

The moment I read, that a verdict of Guilty had been pronounced against Mr. John Hunt, Lord Byron's Publisher, I resolved to print a sixpenny edition. At first, I thought it would be prudent to wait until sentence had been passed upon Mr. Hunt, and then to ask his consent to my publishing: but as the matter has gone off, I deem it prudent to print at once, without asking any person's consent. I mention this, as I dread the idea of being thought disposed to infringe upon what is the property of another. As matters stand at present, I cannot see, that Mr. Hunt will reprint; but the "VISION OF JUDGMENT" SHALL NOT BE SUPPRESSED. It is a publication, a piece of squibbery, on which I set no value: nor do I think it in any degree useful; but the principle which seeks to suppress it is base and malignant, and against that principle I will war. SUCH PROSECUTIONS SHALL NO MORE SUCCEED. By purchasing No. 10 of this volume of "The Republican," the "Vision of Judgment" shall be had for sixpence: and if Murray prosecute any person belonging to me, I will re-hang his picture in my shop. By printing "Wat Tyler" in this form, twenty-five thousand were added to the circulation. I hope to multiply, by some thousands, the "Vision of Judgment."

In No. 11, I shall commence a reply to the pamphlet which Mr. Hindmarsh, the Swedenborgian, has published, in answer to my letter to him, in No. 20, Vol. 8. I shall print the whole of his pamphlet in sections—and say that I am much pleased to find it in print.

The pamphlet published, as a letter to me, by Mr. Thomas Shepherd, of Huddersfield, in answer to my letter to Butterworth, is not deserving of public notice. If he will refer to my letter and compare his quotations, he will see that he has misquoted. As he is a sort of an amusing opponent, I will send him some private observations on his letter, when I have

an hour to spare. I am informed, that Mr. S. began to write a rejoinder in anticipation of my public reply; so he may go on in answer to my anticipated letter! O all ye powers above, below, and around, bless and enlighten this man, for he does not know what Materialism means.

I have received the Quack Bill issued by Dr. Parkins, the Grand Ambassador of Heaven, sent to me by some friends of Manchester: but I cannot descend to notice such an impostor. Are there no magistrates in the neighbourhood of little Gonerby, near Grantham, Lincolnshire? I shewed this bill to my Chaplain, and asked him to say what he thought of my being imprisoned, and such an impostor as this allowed to pick the pockets, destroy the healths, and torture the minds of the ignorant and superstitious, with his books and drugs. Had I not seen it, I could not have believed, that any man, at this time, could have dared to put forth such a bill, and to have so prowled upon the community with impunity.

I have received a second letter from William Carver of New York. He promises me a sketch of the life of Elihu Palmer: and says: "*I do verily believe, that if you come to this country and print the works of Paine, Mirabaud and others, you could make a fortune. There are no laws to prohibit the printing of any works; it is only the fear of the priests and fanatics that prevents the distribution of knowledge.*" What a sketch is this of the state of society in America! What a reflection upon the Americans would it be, for an Englishman to come there and print such works because there was none there bold and honest enough to do it! I am informed, by another friend, from the City of Washington, that almost every thing of the kind is sold as a smuggled article. There is no such thing as a copy of Paine's Age of Reason, or Palmer's Principles of Nature, or Mirabaud, to be purchased publicly in the district of Columbia, or in the state of Maryland. He has brought me a Philadelphia copy of Mirabaud, published in 1808, which seems to be a copy of Hodgson's first edition. I have no taste for crossing the Atlantic, unless it be under a sentence of banishment. Putting taxes out of the question, I am of opinion, that the knowledge of this country guarantees a more sweet and genuine liberty than is to be found in any part of America. I repeat this in a Gaol.

Any person, that can send me a copy of the title page, and so far as A 3 of the Introduction of Tailmin's "Eternity of the Universe" will oblige me, and be useful. I have

a copy beginning at the Introduction, signature A 3. It will be sufficient to copy it in writing.

I am not aware, that I have now any unnoticed correspondents.

RICHARD CARLILE.

Mr. Wheeler of Manchester has published a twopenny life of Thomas Paine, to operate against the religious tract calumnies. It is really a unique. Neat Portrait, and all, for twopence!

DISCUSSION WITH J. E. C.

A THIRD letter received from J. E. C. leaves me no alternative but to insert them all, unsatisfactorily as I believe the reassertion of his conclusions upon the matter of intellect will be to the readers of "The Republican." Further, he will not see but that *power* and *being* are one and the same thing; nor will he remove to other words that may be more correctly expressed as applicable to the point in question. An almighty intellectual being he will have; though he does not offer a shadow of proof that there can be such an existence. When asked *what is intellect?* he refuses to answer: when told what it is, he will not attend; but still makes it suit all his former notions! *Intellect* is nothing more than sensation at its origin or fountain head: we cannot trace sensation beyond the animal world; and yet, J. E. C. will have a huge animal, or sensitive being, as his idol, and for an almighty God! This is not discussion, there is no reasoning with such a man as this; for it has been clearly shewn to him, that all his arguments are hypothetical and erroneous at every point.

When distinguishing between the words *power* and *being*, I have always viewed the former as a non-intellectual force, and the latter as such a creature as idolists fabricate in their minds for the gratification of their religious propensities. Well, I have given up the words *almighty power*; I can do better without than with them; though, I repeat, that my construction was tantamount to demonstration. *Powers*, *forces*, do exist; whether finite, or comprehensible, or incomprehensible, the word *all* was not improperly used to

express the aggregate or whole: and this may be done without making it necessary that I should define the extent or quality of those powers. I am satisfied that my expression was strictly right and clear; though it might not have tallied with the common notions of the word *almighty*.

I will rest the whole matter of dispute between J. E. C. and myself, upon the questions: what is intellect? Is it any thing separate from animal sensations? Here I fix him and wait his answer.

R. CARLILE.

MR. CARLILE.

Dec. 15, 1823.

SIR,
It is enough to make any one smile to hear you and your parsons dispute about what you call demonstration, and to see you pose the Vicar of Cerne, with a distinction where there is no difference—between almighty power and almighty being—when one must include all that is requisite and essential to the other. Review it again, Sir, I pray you; such a demonstration you “believe in, &c,”—You are “sensible of, &c.” you are “not sensible of, &c,” Why, Sir, this is no kin to demonstration, it would weigh the same if you was to substitute the witch of Endor; besides, no one can be sensible of an almighty power: they may be sensible of a superior power, but an almighty power is known only by deduction. Carter comes nearer demonstration, when he says, “an almighty power cannot be exerted, but by an almighty being,” because exerting must be designing and directing. Sir, you say, “a multitude of bodies may congregate their powers, and form an almighty power.” This is your creed condensed; and such is your “present notion of an almighty God, an almighty power.” This transposed, stands thus: an independent power may be formed of a number of congregated powers; for almighty power must be independent power, therefore synonymous and “chemical powers, mechanical forces, conflicting varieties, &c. &c.” are but some of the congregated powers, and therefore all of them, and more, are included in that term.

Now let us see; in the first place, if they are physical forces, moving without self direction, they must have exterior direction, for motion without direction, is an effect without a cause, and this directing power must be a designing power, (divide it if you can;) or say if that which moves, is not self moved and self directed; it moves by impulse, and this impelling power must be, or be originated by, a directing and projecting power, for if we

trace such impelling, undesigning causes, or power, upwards, ad infinitum, and find no projecting, directing cause, we find nothing but effects without a cause, and even eternity cannot rescue effects without a cause from contradiction; though it can the cause when found; thus an almighty power, must be an independent, directive, designing power, or being, a cause from whom all events depend.

Let us now see it in another position. "An almighty (or independent) power may be formed of a number of congregated powers." Suppose each power to have self direction, and power independent of each other; now to be independent of each other, they must have a superior, (and perhaps this is where your error has so long lain hid) they must have a common base, a common right, a guarantee of possession; if there is no law, no force, above them, they merge into one, or you can have no conception of more than one independent power; therefore, a number of powers cannot constitute or compose an almighty, because there must be first an almighty power to constitute or compose them¹.

Take another view; take your hypothesis for granted; say a number of powers congregate and form almighty power; congregating, in this case, is amalgamating; resumption is impossible, seeing that all power on which to rest it, is absorbed, an army may separate from their general, but the particles of the fused metal are easier separated than such power. And then, to doubly settle the question of direction and design, we have only to consider that the all of existence must include intellect, be it what it may, whether understanding, knowledge, thought, design, will, memory, or reason; and by this you may easily decide your question, whether animal organization is essential to the production of intellect; for, a power possessing all, must possess intellect, before he attaches it to organization, thus organization cannot be essential; since there is nothing to dictate to him, or compel him. Thus, for the sake of illustration, if there was this moment, a tangible supreme, the next, he might be intangible, if he willed it; seeing he must have absolute dominion, and actual possession of all power possible to be conceived².

Your humble and obliged Servant,

J. E. C.

TO MR. CARLILE.

SIR, January 5, 1824.
If it is not too obtrusive, I would request you to insert a few re-
son¹ And something to compose that almighty power: and so on?

R. C.

² This is quite above my comprehension. Tell us what is, not what may be.

R. C.

marks on your notes or observations, on passages of my letter in your Republican of Dec. 19th.

The first I shall notice, is in page 743, on these words: "there is no one but acknowledges some superior power; every one must see mankind are under the controul of something." On this, you observe; "The same as all other kind." I reply, certainly. And so far we are agreed. A few lines farther on, I thus explain: "I mean he will not deny he is subject to something, and this something, he will conceive to have intelligence." Here you say, this conception is no proof. Yes, I reply, that the ideas are naturally connected, that they cannot be separated without laceration, or violence; it strikes the unbiassed mind with conviction, equal to demonstration, that physical force must be an operation of design or intelligence; that mere physical force is a nullity, without direction³; or being of itself null, or without direction, it must be originated and directed by some energy, internal, or external; and in this they are not far distant from the profoundest philosophy; at least, they stray not from the road, they merely substitute immediate for ultimate, superior for omnipotent.

In the next sentence, speaking of nature, I say, "She has a motion, and she has an influence, or rather, you feel and know her power." You have a note on this, saying; "A barrel of gunpowder at my elbow—I dread the approach of a spark of fire—I know the power of exploding gunpowder; but I know no intelligence attached to it; whilst I sit at my desk, a tremendous storm rages, I know its power, but nothing of its intelligence." Certainly, you know nothing of its intelligence, or of any immediate intelligence; but you acknowledge an independent power; and you own an effect must have a cause: you own all we have just noticed are subject to natural causes, even those things composed by human means, their internal composition, their consequentsusceptibility, depend on natural causes, their motion and contact, must have a cause, their varieties or variations, their qualities, their influences, must have their causes, yourself is subject to natural causes; therefore, you own the power of nature; that which is subject to a cause, is, of course, an effect; but all cannot be effects without a cause: and all which have no choice are effects, and have a cause; therefore, there must be an originating cause, or principle, or independent power, to which nothing but impossibility or contradiction, can set bounds; and he must possess all which is known to an infinite extent, therefore all which exists must be concatenated by design, or superintended by intelligence⁴. Thus, if you know the power of nature, and admit

³ J. E. C. has no correct knowledge of the properties of matter in motion; no correct notion of physical forces. Is the explosion of gunpowder a designed direction? Is the eruption of a volcano a designed direction? Is frost, snow, hail, rain, thunder, lightning, designed direction? R. C.

⁴ This deduction is unwarranted. There is a general something which

THE REPUBLICAN.

you own yourself subject to non-entity; which can terminate in a confusion of ideas⁵. Here let impartiality determine which approaches nearest to the truth, the confused or the straightforward mind.

In your next note you say, "intellect is one of the many dissimilar varieties of the effects of matter in motion; not distinguishable in matter, but in animal matter only."

Now suppose we subscribe to the wild theory, and admit the ~~axiom~~ that "intellect is one of the many dissimilar varieties of the effects of matter in motion;" still, as I have just said, there can be ~~no~~ other source, but independent existence, from which it can be drawn, it must be originated by, or an emanation from, design; you think it is created by the tremulous motion of your agitated matter; you think there is a creative power in confusion. You think the transitions of nature, and the concussions of nature, are the support of nature. Like two children "you shall carry me, and I will carry you, and we will fly."

But though intellect is "not distinguishable in all matter," yet it is distinguishable, and obvious to our reason, that all matter must be guided by it; and though it is only apparent to our senses, that animal matter possesses it, yet it is the unavoidable conclusion of our reason, that that which gave it, or that source whence alone it could emanate, possessing all in an unboundable degree, must possess that also without limitation. Almighty power is anomalous without intellect. Independence curtailed or deprived of, or debarred from, any thing, or the exercise of ~~any~~ power, is independence no longer.

In your next note you say; "I have seen no argument. Such a power would exhibit itself, and need no support from words." This is strange indeed! for, if I understand your meaning, it is ~~not~~ ~~any~~ ~~power~~ about it⁶. But, let me ask, if such a power or ~~any~~ ~~power~~ (for they are terms of the same import) cannot be exhibited by any natural process, how do you conceive it can be exhibited by ~~any~~ ~~power~~? If you reply, "to my senses," I answer, they are not sufficiently capacious: even though they had a million times their compass, they could but inform you of ~~any~~ ~~power~~, which they will do at present. If you think to the ~~any~~ ~~power~~, constitute, without delay, your almighty sen-

~~any~~ ~~power~~; now, you cannot mention any one effect but that it is a ~~result~~ ~~product~~ of matter and motion, from one to another particular kind, ~~and~~ the force of its own motion and change, the greater continuing the lesser force, and so working by accumulation and ~~succession~~ ~~succession~~, as in a circle, always coming to the same end. R. C.

I never ~~intended~~ ~~intended~~ declare that I can perceive nothing but confusion of ~~any~~ ~~power~~ in this sentence.

R. C.

It is useless to raise up phantoms in our minds for the sake of quarrelling about them, when our time may be so much better employed in analysing ~~any~~ ~~power~~.

R. C.

sible, (or rather insensible) power, and though you seat him, or it, on a supposed throne of adamant; the demolition will be at least as certain as that of Aaron's golden calf, or Nebuchadnezzar's enormous God of Dura.

The next I shall take notice of, is a remark of yours on a passage which occurs in page 745, where I ask if there is no almighty power, but that is cognizable by our senses; who gave the various parts of the universe their secret influences or virtues; amongst the rest, intellect and life to man: on this you say, "Let J. E. C. first shew that those parts were ever without their present secret influences and virtues." In reply, I must assert this is by no means necessary; two things might always be conjoined, yet possible to be detached, and if we can prove their juncture optional, we shew their separation possible; and that we prove when we demonstrate that an independent power exists; for such power makes, and is of course amenable to no laws, though he may not only support, but observe the laws he makes; however, look to the corpse if it cannot give an elucidation and example. In the next page, 746, you say "J. E. C. has not yet proved that a first cause has need of a will." If Sir, you had appreciated, or had been attentive to, or weighed my former demonstrations, you would have found I had done so. A first cause must be an almighty power, or almighty being, an almighty power existing under any deficiency, is a contradiction; without will or any other power, he must be deficient, and cannot be almighty, but with them, he must be a being; thus an almighty power, and an almighty being are the same; but our limited optics can but see a partial prospect; if our comprehension was more extensive, perhaps we might see, that all these are not different divisions really, but different views of our own, of one indivisible power, which Sir Isaac Newton has expressed, though imperfectly, by all eye, all ear, all arm, and that though the conceptions and perceptions of Locke, with respect to the human understanding, and his divisions of it, may be generally correct, yet it may be highly improper, when applied to the (perhaps) homogeneous power of the Supreme; but be this as it will, we are here on the margin of a boundless ocean, which it is better not to navigate; but the compass of reason will suffice in the seas, which we may traverse to inform us, that what is possessed by man, must be so in an infinite degree where no bounds can exist, and from whence all must be received; thus the will of man, in its own aspiring nature, would be boundless power, or boundless in its operation; but not only is his operations bounded, but confined to very narrow limits; the strong hand of power is upon him, or surrounds him: but this has no reference to a being, who has no superior, his will or power must be (as I have said before) "unbounded as his wish;" nay, the very circumstance of independence proves a choice or will.

Sir, "the proper study of mankind is man." The chief dan-

not design, you own yourself subject to non-entity; which can but originate in a confusion of ideas⁵. Here let impartiality determine which approaches nearest to the truth, the confused or the untaught mind.

In your next note you say, "intellect is one of the many dissimilar varieties of the effects of matter in motion; not distinguishable in matter, but in animal matter only."

Now suppose we subscribe to the wild theory, and admit the dogma that "intellect is one of the many dissimilar varieties of the effects of matter in motion:" still, as I have just said, there can be no other source, but independent existence, from which it can be drawn, it must be originated by, or an emanation from, design; you think it is created by the tremulous motion of your agitated matter; you think there is a creative power in confusion. You think the transitions of nature, and the concussions of nature, are the support of nature. Like two children "you shall carry me, and I will carry you, and we will fly."

But though intellect is "not distinguishable in all matter," yet it is distinguishable, and obvious to our reason, that all matter must be guided by it; and though it is only apparent to our senses, that animal matter possesses it, yet it is the unavoidable conclusion of our reason, that that which gave it, or that source from whence alone it could emanate, possessing all in an unbounded degree, must possess that also without limitation. Almighty power, is anomalous without intellect. Independence curtailed of, or deprived of, or debarred from, any thing, or the exercise of any power, is independence no longer.

In your next note you say; "I have seen no argument. Such a power would exhibit itself, and need no support from words." This is strange indeed! for, if I understand your meaning, it is useless to argue about it⁶. But, let me ask, if such a power or being, (for they are terms of the same import) cannot be recognized by a rational process, how do you conceive it can be exhibited, supposing it to exist? If you reply, "to my senses," I answer, they are not sufficiently capacious: even though they had a million times their compass, they could but inform you of superior power, which they will do at present. If you think to the contrary; describe, constitute, without delay, your almighty sen-

~~-~~
we all call **matter**; now, you cannot mention any one effect but that it is a mere variation of matter and motion, from one to another particular kind, being in itself the cause of its own motion and change, the greater continually subduing the lesser force, and so working by accumulation and dispersion, round, as in a circle, always coming to the same end. R. C.

I most sincerely declare that I can perceive nothing but confusion of ideas, in this sentence. R. C.

It is useless to raise up phantoms in our minds for the sake of quarreling about them, when our time may be so much better employed in analyzing substances. R. C.

sible, (or rather insensible) power, and though you seat him, or it, on a supposed throne of adamant; the demolition will be at least as certain as that of Aaron's golden calf, or Nebuchadnezzar's enormous God of Dura.

The next I shall take notice of, is a remark of yours on a passage which occurs in page 745, where I ask if there is no almighty power, but that is cognizable by our senses; who gave the various parts of the universe their secret influences or virtues; amongst the rest, intellect and life to man: on this you say, "Let J. E. C. first shew that those parts were ever without their present secret influences and virtues." In reply, I must assert this is by no means necessary; two things might always be conjoined, yet possible to be detached, and if we can prove their juncture optional, we shew their separation possible; and that we prove when we demonstrate that an independent power exists; for such power makes, and is of course amenable to no laws, though he may not only support, but observe the laws he makes; however, look to the corpse if it cannot give an elucidation and example. In the next page, 746, you say "J. E. C. has not yet proved that a first cause has need of a will." If Sir, you had appreciated, or had been attentive to, or weighed my former demonstrations, you would have found I had done so. A first cause must be an almighty power, or almighty being, an almighty power existing under any deficiency, is a contradiction; without will or any other power, he must be deficient, and cannot be almighty, but with them, he must be a being; thus an almighty power, and an almighty being are the same; but our limited optics can but see a partial prospect; if our comprehension was more extensive, perhaps we might see, that all these are not different divisions really, but different views of our own, of one indivisible power, which Sir Isaac Newton has expressed, though imperfectly, by all eye, all ear, all arm, and that though the conceptions and perceptions of Locke, with respect to the human understanding, and his divisions of it, may be generally correct, yet it may be highly improper, when applied to the (perhaps) homogeneous power of the Supreme; but be this as it will, we are here on the margin of a boundless ocean, which it is better not to navigate; but the compass of reason will suffice in the seas, which we may traverse to inform us, that what is possessed by man, must be so in an infinite degree where no bounds can exist, and from whence all must be received; thus the will of man, in its own aspiring nature, would be boundless power, or boundless in its operation; but not only is his operations bounded, but confined to very narrow limits; the strong hand of power is upon him, or surrounds him: but this has no reference to a being, who has no superior, his will or power must be (as I have said before) "unbounded as his wish;" nay, the very circumstance of independence proves a choice or will. Sir, "the proper study of mankind is man." The chief dan-

ger of mankind, is in extremes; his chief, or the basis of his virtue, is moderation and self command. But no sooner do some professed philosophers extricate themselves from the harpy claws of superstition and inconsistency, than instead of submitting to the guidance and decisions of reason, they fall into the arms of sense; not corporeally, but what is worse, mentally, their mental vision they extinguish, they will be guided by, they will believe nought but their senses: reason says, "come, I will exalt you, sense must submit to me," but no, they reply, "we will stand firm, we will not quit the earth;" thus reason, which rescued them from danger, is despised, and thrown into the back ground with her former enemies; whilst they make a compact with the brutes of the forests and the wilds.

A little further, in the same page, speaking of intellect existing, and shewing that as there is but one sole or independent existence, "this is sufficient to identify it with that sole existence or cause." You say, "As a part dissimilar to other parts, but not as a whole." Whether, Sir, you understand yourself, I do not know, but this I know, at least, my reason assures me that if identified with, or even possessed by, such existence, it must be the vital⁷, directing principle, but there needs no other proof of its universality or infinity, than the independence of the power which possesses it. But you perhaps are still thinking of organization, and that intellect being seated in one part, its influence will not reach to other parts; but allowing the brain to be the seat of perception, you might have had an example in yourself, that your feet were influenced or directed by it, without requiring brains also in them⁸.

In your next note you say, "knowledge is certainly created." Let me ask how is this to happen? We cannot gain a knowledge of any thing before it exists⁹, or create or cause it to exist to gain a knowledge of it; if you allude to the work of our own hands, we only arrange, dispose, or modify, that which already exists, we do not create; but if we did create as well as arrange; the knowledge is not created, but follows the creation.

In your last note in page 750, you say, "Your fifth proposition is by no means a necessary inference of the first four which are granted, Who is to know what is meant by vitality in so im-

⁷ There is a wide difference between vitality and design. Design cannot exist without vitality, but vitality may, and does exist, without the capacity to design. Design is nothing more than a power which results from animal experience, and can only be acquired by experience.

R. C.

⁸ I consider my great toe to have the quality of perception as well as the brain; or in your phrase, that I have brains in my great toe.

R. C.

⁹ But the thing may exist without our gaining a knowledge of it; and the acquisition is the creation of that knowledge.

R. C.

portant a question as the universe? All forces are directing forces: all forces proceed from other forces: but how can we connect that vitality which defines intellect with the known forces of matter?" Sir, I shall leave the first part of your observation to your readers, for them to decide; and shall confine myself, for the present, to where you say, "All forces are directing forces; all forces proceed from other forces." Now, though I cannot conceive how you can have any clear idea of your own meaning, still I shall endeavour to understand as much as I can collect of your meaning; and this is what I accordingly collect. You conceive there may be direction without design; you conceive that those undesigning directive forces can originate vitality and intellect, though in but very small quantities, because you see them in but very small quantities; you believe every portion of matter has its share of direction¹⁰, though it does not know what it is doing; that every part like a well constituted Republic, chuses what is best calculated for its preservation or well being, without calculating at all; you believe in an independent power, constituted by those powers; but so far from independent, that it has not the power of the most limited mortal monarch having no choice of action: a people may hold their rights from nature, or the God of nature, but an independent sovereignty or almighty power without design, yet directive, constituted by, or composed of a number of powers directed without design, and without any definition of, or guarantee for the possession of their reciprocal rights, is I say but a very wild scheme for an universal government; so wild indeed, that a Richard Brothers, or a Johanna Southcote, would have turned up their eyes in amaze, that any one could find followers and flatterers that broached doctrines so repugnant to reason.

Further you ask, "How can we connect that vitality which defines intellect, with the known forces of matter." I have, Sir, I think, sufficiently shewn, that the known forces of matter must be connected with intellect¹¹; that is, they must be originated, which in its full signification means designed, (but for the better understanding it, which is alone my object) we will say, originated by design or that the first link of the chain on which it hangs is held by design; or that all things must have their origin in design, or they must be a nonentity, or an effect without a cause; for that which has no will, choice, or design, which terms are synonymous, is impelled, and can have no power of its own: and with respect to vitality and intellect, they will connect themselves

¹⁰ All matter is in motion; all motion is at the same time a force, and the result of a force, or a constant communication of force from the one to the other body. But the abstract of general matter and motion is beyond my comprehension.

R. C.

¹¹ There can be no shewing without the exhibition of Practical proofs. Assumed inferences upon any such a subject can satisfy no lover of truth, no candid enquirer.

R. C.

where intellect exists; for intellect cannot exist without vitality' though vitality can exist without intellect: but as to the definition of intellect by vitality, I have neither attempted it, or seen it attempted, all things (as I have said) must have their origin in, and be subject to, design ultimately, or be subject to no cause; and design may include intellect, and must, as the cause of all, or it may define intellect, and must be connected with vitality; but we have many instances of vitality without it; yet intellect from its connection and its nature, appears to be but a higher, or more perfect degree of vitality, but we cannot define the nature, or compute the extent of the oak by the inspection of the acorn.

Yours respectfully,
J. E. C.

P. S. You will excuse this irregular mode of correspondence, but I had forgot one note of yours, saying, "I did not know my correspondent before I read this passage. Would J. E. C. insinuate that both father and daughter had grown ignorant, and if so, will he explain how this can be done?" To this I reply, I do not insinuate that they have grown ignorant, but that they have not grown knowing or wise; the father was ignorant enough to tell the daughter what to believe, and she believed accordingly¹²: he now, because he has been to the alehouse, tells her to believe something different, and she believes accordingly; but he has learnt something different you say—good; but, will the slave, because he has changed his master, or even though just emancipated, immediately make a good legislator? I wish a man to look at his opinions in every situation and position before he inculcates them. But what you mean by saying you know me, I can scarcely guess: do you think I am averse to science or learning¹³? Do you wish such people as these to espouse your opinions, with, or without due investigation; to flatter, and to follow in your train? Or do you wish them to thoroughly examine¹⁴, to decide for themselves, and make their own creed, to gain knowledge, to search out truth, and wish them to find it, whether for or against yourself? If you do this, I will hail you, though in error, the Champion of Truth. You say you know me:—

"But give a tongue to such a cause as this,
And if you hold me tardy in the call,
You know me not." BROOKE.

¹² A change of mind was noticed both in father and daughter: and J. E. C. said, or imputed, that it was a growth of ignorance. The father was the alehouse keeper.

R. C.

¹³ J. E. C. exhibited poignant dissatisfaction at the assertion that this father, daughter, and others, had ceased to be Christians: I thought he was not a Christian, until I saw that display of Christian feeling.

R. C.

¹⁴ There was evidence that these persons had so examined, by an association for reading and discussion.

R. C.

You are not perhaps thoroughly aware that science, ill understood, is very liable to be misapplied, and it is only the proper application of it, which is likely to benefit or ameliorate the condition of mankind. Precipitate cogitations once launched, are like unripe fruits once plucked, they have no good flavour; and it is very singular indeed, if time, which ameliorates some things, will ever make them better. This was the occasion of my saying,

“A little learning is a dangerous thing,”

To which I will now subjoin,

“Drink deep or taste not the Pierian spring;

There shallow draughts intoxicate the brain,

And drinking largely sobers us again.” POPE.

Mr. Locke says, “There are not so many men in errors, and wrong opinions, as is commonly supposed. Not that I think they embrace the truth; but indeed because concerning those doctrines they keep such a stir about, they have no thought, no opinion at all. They are resolved to stick to a party that education or interest has engaged them in; and like the common soldiers of an army, shew their courage and warmth as their leaders direct, without ever examining the cause they contend for.”

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

SIR, January 22, 1824.

I WOULD willingly reply to Mr. Watson’s letter of Dec. 9; but, as I think I perceive a reluctance to the insertion of arguments which are not in accordance with certain wishes, I shall decline it, till I see symptoms of the contrary; but, I will just observe for the present, that mature reflection, and a more accurate mode of thinking and connecting his ideas, may effect a coincidence in our conclusions from which he is now but a short distance, so short indeed, that they are almost within his reach, but from which with all his efforts he cannot make his escape. Thus, an army once safe in a Cul de Sac, it is useless and cruel to attack each individual soldier, when they are commanded by the artillery on the mountains which surround them.

I shall now say a few words to yourself, in which I shall be as brief as possible. You ask me “what is intellect—whence does it arise—and to what known object is it confined?” Here are three questions, the first is, what is intellect? Now we must all confess, the archetype we have of it is that possessed by man; now for the sake of perspicuity (if not propriety) call it the highest degree of life or vitality, (not the highest that we can conceive

or demonstrate) but that we are acquainted with, or is apparent; and this for the sake of agreeing to some thing specific. Not that vitality can define intellect, for that which should define, should be better known than the term to be defined, whereas, intellect I take to be better known to us than the subordinate or inferior degrees of vitality: besides, nothing can be defined by itself, and this is here taken to be the same in kind, differing in degree. But, if it were asked where I would place the confines of intellect? I answer, where the comparing and connecting of ideas begin, whatever form the object comparing or connecting might bear. Your next question is, "Whence does it arise?" I answer, from an only or almighty, eternal, and intelligent power, in whom it is alone inherent. You yourself say it arises from, or is produced by organization, and that organization is produced by the elements, or the operations of matter, and that matter is the all of nature or existence; of course, that there is nothing above it, or can exist to controul it, consequently that it originates its own operations, performs those operations, and attaches intellect to portions of itself. Now answer me. If it, or matter, is the sole existence, if nothing exists to controul it, why does it not organize its whole mass or substance, and be intellectual throughout, non-entity being unable to oppose¹⁵; for the power to possess is equal to the possession, the power to become, or be intelligent, is equal to being so. Thus, Sir, if matter is, as you say, the extreme power, and once was not intelligent, you pursue the road, only to shew first, it has become intelligent, but that intelligence presides, and that matter is subservient; and thus to meet me at a point to which you make a painful circuit, for once intelligent and without opposition, matter is no longer an impediment.

Now, Sir, if you can perceive the connection of the foregoing, with the ideas to which they must adhere, you will see that organization, with respect to a first and intellectual power, is dispensed with¹⁶, for non-existence can impose no necessity, and laws imposed by an object, or being, on itself, is nugatory and absurd. Thus you will recognize the existence of eternal intellect or that intellect must be prior to organization, of course that organization is not its essential, and that as no superior power existed to in-force, or there being nothing to dictate, no bonds, bounds, or laws could exist; of consequence that such power must be free in force, form, and substance, and that instead of intellect being subject to organization, organization must be subject to it.

¹⁵ Because organized matter can only be supported in its distinct organizations, referring to animals and vegetables, by the disorganization of other matter. If all were organized, there would be no support for that organization. Another blow at your intelligent almighty, Mr. J. E. C.

R. C.

¹⁶ Impossible! Shew that intellect can exist separate from a vital organization.

R. C.

And this I conceive is answering your third question also, and I hope satisfactorily. I have been accused of sophistry, but I appeal to the world as the arbiter, to mankind as the jury, whether the accusation be true. I plead that nothing but quibble has been returned as answer to arguments I conceive unanswerable. I expect indeed to hear that nature, or (as it is taken for) the all of existence, can only operate and produce, as we see her to operate and produce, that she cannot substitute renovation for dissolution, duration for mutation: but, before I take notice of this wild, this mere assertion, I must have an answer to this harder question. What is to prevent her¹⁷?

If laws be imposed, there must be something to impose them. That on which laws are imposed must be subjected, or under subjection. Laws self-imposed are but resolves, or resolutions, or self-subjection. To assert that a certain thing is not possest of a certain thing; and yet can of, and from, itself produce that certain thing, is a falsity, contradiction, and absurdity. Inert matter producing vitality is accordingly an absurdity. Or insensible matter of, and from, itself producing intellect is the same thing. Therefore intellect must not only have the precedence but sole power, for there is nothing external which is essential to intellect; it must be its own essential. It is out of the power of nature to conceive vitality or intellect given to any thing by itself without conceiving prior possession. Thus organization is appointed by, or is subservient to, intellect or vitality, for organization cannot be the essential or it would be (if I may use the expression) more vital than vitality, more intellectual than intellect. The first or highest power, having all power, must act optionally, therefore all process is optional, or none is requisite.

Intellectual must therefore be that independent power, the source alike of intellect and physical power, of course all physical is but secondary power, appointed or optional. All plurality of power must have a common basis or support; for apportioned power is proportioned power dependent on law or right, and a law is a nullity without a power to sanction; therefore there must exist an unique, absolute, intellectual power or being. Nothing being essential to himself, but himself¹⁸.

Before I conclude this letter, I will just observe, I am ready to appeal to the world whether a shadow of an argument has been advanced tending to refute any one position I have endeavoured to maintain¹⁹. Mr. Watson has certainly said much, but nothing

¹⁷ The absence of power. Design cannot make butter out of chalk and water, nor can a Jesus convert water to wine, without the aid of some vinous properties. R. C.

¹⁸ These are words; refer to the things you mean, and then you may be, followed. If not already one, I commend J. E. C. to the sect of Swedenborgians. R. C.

¹⁹ Here I consent to join that appeal, and to stay this wordy discussion:

tending to shake the question, any more than he could shake Mount Atlas by throwing at it a handful of the sand of the desert over which he might pass.

I desired him to examine with a mind "severe as arctic climes." But he has told me he has examined with a mind "intense (intensely hot of course) as the torrid zone." Which appears by his propensity to recur to his favourite and hackneyed theme of declamation against priests and all else who may oppose him. I really and feelingly deplored the errors of my fellows; but he can retort by saying he can "see literary acquirements prostituted," and "men of highly cultivated minds engaged in perverting truth." Now, Sir, let this declaration suffice, that I am by no means interested in the discussion further than concerns the cause of truth. I am neither priest nor politician of the country; I am neither concerned in fame or fortune, I need neither; and though I would remove oppression in any country, I am safe in the midst of it. Mr. Watson has talked of my erroneous, at the same time with my powerful, reasoning; but it would take something more powerful than the following, which is a fair specimen, or rather the depth of his research to invalidate it.

He says: "No one will deny the position of J. E. C. that it is impossible for any thing to be more powerful than all powerful, higher than the highest. But the all powerful, or highest power in the production of life, mind, and motion, and the modification of matter, I presume, reside in the collective operations and productive properties of nature, or in the elements of matter, and then to be all-powerful or the highest power, when influencing or operating upon the universe in toto; in which mind or intelligence is no ways concerned in directing and overruling the operations carried farward; therefore it is process and not controul." I here ask what do you call sophistry? Now before I scrutinize further, I will submit that the difference between a man and a brute is, the one has reason, the other has nothing but sense; if a man will give up all claim to the comparison and consequence of the connection of his ideas, and will rely on nothing but his senses he throws away, and can have but little advantage above a brute, and should by no means ask for demonstration: but if asking for, and receiving, he opposes assertions and surmises to proofs, he is equally unfit for the contest. I have myself asserted nothing but that bore its own evidence, and where that was wanting I have produced corroborating ideas. Mr. Watson, in the above extract, says in substance, "I presume the highest power resides in the elements of matter: and when operating upon the universe in toto, mind or intelligence is no way concerned." I once told you, before he wrote this, Mr. Watson could see through the arcana of and, hereafter, I commend J. E. C. to seek a knowledge of such things as offer themselves to our examination.

R. C.

all nature, and this proves it; else how could he assert (which must be from his own knowledge, for he brings no evidence with him) how could he assert that mind or intelligence is no way concerned, or how could he presume that the highest power resides in the collective operations and properties of matter? Now I will presume in my turn, that one self-evident axiom will overturn all his presumptions. It is this: that which can produce and possess intellect, is itself intellectual. Or, philosophically guarded and clothed, it will stand thus: that which can of itself, and of its own independence, produce, and consequently possess intellect, must be itself inherently intellectual: *ergo*, mind resides in the highest power²⁰.

This, Sir, is the third letter I have sent, which has not been inserted in your Republican; I certainly and thankfully acknowledge your attention and favour respecting those which preceeded, but if you reject the insertion of these when the discussion had come nearly to a close, I doubtless shall not feel satisfied that that fairness has been allowed, which I was led to apprehend after you had again, and repeatedly invited investigation. However, the publication is your own, and you must, will, and have a right to use your own discretion; but if you will publish these I have sent you, I will engage to make no future complaint or claim, and I can then bear testimony to your honour and your candour, and will say you do not shrink from inquiry.

Yours respectfully and sincerely,
J. E. C.

²⁰ No! Nothing but an animal can produce and possess intellect. There I stand, and will not allow you to move until you have overthrown that visible conclusion, that fact, that reality, that thing.

R. C.

ODE TO RELIGION.

WHAT art thou, phantom of Caprice,
Veil'd in the rolling clouds of Doubt,
Now singing to the lute of Peace,
Now trumpeter to War's wild rout?
How shall the magic skill be mine,
Thy art, thy nature, to define,
To view by Truth's bright lamp thy inmost cave?
O! that I could thy riddle solve,
Then like the Sphinx, thou mightst involve
Thy power mischievous in Destruction's grave.

How vast a scope thy spells engross!

How wild and strange thy deeds have been!

Thou didst erect the bloody cross!

Where died the enthusiast NAZARENE.

Thy rancour wove the webs of flame

That mantled round SERVETUS' frame,

And hoary CRANMER's aged limb's encased;

And in a more enlighten'd age,

For EATON rais'd scorn's public stage,

And in Oppression's dungeon HOUSTON plac'd.

Are not these THY demoniac glooms?

Or is there some impostor sprite,

Who thus thy specious robe assumes,

And wields the mace of earthly might.

Whose rage drove Emigration's host

To people vast Columbia's coast,

And rais'd at Nantz the persecuting storm;

Who on Bartholomew's Eve accr'd

His stiff'ning knees in blood immers'd,

And scowls his bloodshot eyes on Erin's woe-worn form.

Where dost thou most delight to dwell?

Close in some woody Mountain's side,

Embosom'd in the Hermit's cell?

Or in the rich Cathedral's pride?

Dost thou behold with Pleasure's smile,

The widow'd Hindoo's burning pile?

Or ride and revel on the vesper's note?

Are sleeves of lawn thy favourite wear,

The mitred cone or tonsure bare,

The Rabbi's vest, or Quaker's modest coat?

Or are those fond enthusiasts right,

Who see thy visionary shade

Enrob'd in weeds of purest white,

Contemplative in Virtue's glade?

And whether at the morning's beam,

At noon reposing by the stream,

Or musing on the golden hills at eve,

Revolving plans of human weal,

To teach the wayward heart to feel

Its own defects, and others to relieve.

Ah! didst thou act this generous part,

Didst thou with this pure lustre shine,

Then shouldst thou find no human heart

A warmer devotee than mine;

But in thy gathering shades confin'd,

Truth can no certain pathway find,

And Reason vainly tries, amid the gloom,

To lift on high her beacon torch,

Construct her vast exalted porch,

And lift to other spheres her well-proportioned doom.

THE CELEBRATION OF PAINE'S BIRTH-DAY

IN LEEDS,

WAS ANNOUNCED BY THE FOLLOWING ADVERTISEMENT:

BIRTH-DAY OF THE IMMORTAL PAINE.

"THURSDAY, the 29th Instant, being the Birth-day of THOMAS PAINE, the author of the "*Rights of Man*," and the great Advocate of Republican Governments, the Friends of this useful Man's writings, intend to commemorate his Birth-Day by making a PUBLIC SUBSCRIPTION for the unjustly incarcerated, RICHARD CARLILE, the bold Advocate for Free Discussion, to assist him in propagating that useful Man's Principles and the Liberty of the Press.

THE Meeting having assembled, Mr. Samuel Ingham took the Chair, and with a few laudatory observations toasted,

"The memory of the Immortal Thomas Paine."

Mr. Byerley addressed the meeting on the utility of reading the works of Thomas Paine.

The Immortal memory of Mirabaud.

Kershaw Crowther addressed the meeting, as follows:—

Gentlemen, the disciples of Mirabaud are strangely character-

ised as hideous monsters of vice. Prejudice, this child of education, is so deeply rooted in Christendom, that even the name of such a disciple is productive of dreadfully bad passions on those who do not know what are his principles; and persecution is everywhere seen. But we have a great object before us: no less than the emancipation of the human mind. To this end, correct principles must be disseminated. We must labour to convince of error, the poor infatuated beings, who bow the knee to they know not what, to the idols of their imagination. Volney, in his "Ruins of Empires," has the subsequent remarkable passage, relating to the priesthood: "Yes, these men are robbers and hypocrites—they preach humility the more to enslave simplicity, to inveigle confidence: they promise another world the better to invade this; and while they preach toleration and charity, they commit to the flames, in the name of God, every one who does not worship him exactly as they do."

Thomas Paine, who first taught us the value of free discussion, the anniversary of whose birth we have this evening met to celebrate, states, "that ignorance is the source of oppression," and it is my decided opinion, that ignorance is alone the cause of its continuance. Oppressors and priests are fully aware of this; hence it is, that they endeavour, by every possible means, to stem the progress of knowledge; nay, even God himself, is said to be about to empty the phials of his wrath upon the Wesleyan connection, because, forsooth, poor children are taught to write on the Sabbath day! Ah! ye despicable beings! ye monsters of iniquity! ye brutalizing priests and oppressors! be gone, be gone. I am happy to state that yours is the opposite course, your object is to illuminate, and finally to liberate the human race. Go on, then, ye disseminators of truth, go on ye advocates of morality; go on in imitation of the intrepid Carlile; go on, for your names shall live when you are dead, go on, for generations yet unknown shall perpetuate your fame; go on, for even conquered oppressors, in after ages, shall bless the memory of the disciples of nature.

Say you, we are now persecuted, true; but remember the excellent motto of Armenius, that "a good conscience is a paradise;" and does not this result from mental fidelity; and are not you mentally faithful, is not this paradise yours? preserve it inviolate at all hazards, persevere, examine the history of the puritans: consider the sufferings of the Quakers; see their firmness, mark the success which crowned their labours, and finally imitate their example; for, only by this means, liberty and free discussion will ultimately be obtained.

I have already stated, that, in order that the great object which we have in view may be obtained; correct principles must be disseminated, but correct principles cannot be disseminated without a free press; and how is this to be obtained? The answer is to be found in the example of the brave Carlile; and shall he not be supported? Let it never be said that the top

stone of freedom could not be laid on for want of supporters; but on the contrary; let every exertion be made that circumstances will permit, till the earth be filled with everlasting freedom.

I conclude by giving you, The memory of Percy Byshe Shelley, the author of "Queen Mab."

John Smithson then rose and stated, that he had received a letter from a worthy friend, which he would read.

TO JOHN SMITHSON, LEEDS.

Otley, January 28, 1824.

DEAR SIR,

I SHOULD have felt much pleasure in meeting you and your Friends in Leeds, to morrow, to celebrate the Anniversary of the Birth of a man, whom I consider as the greatest that ever lived, but I cannot so far gratify my inclination without material inconvenience. But feeling the obligations that I, with a large portion of mankind, already owe him, and anticipating the immense benefits, which I confidently trust, the world at large will, at some, and I hope no very distant period, reap from the invaluable principles propagated in his writings, I think it my duty to forward you this small token of my respect for his memory. I have contemplated with emotions of reverence and admiration the actions and characters of ancient and modern Patriots, but I know of none who is fit to stand upon a pedestal so elevated in the Temple of Fame as Thomas Paine. The names of Aristides, Timoleon, Thrasybulus, Leonidas, Epaminondas, Cincinnatus, Cato, Brutus, Hampden, Sydney, Brissot, Franklin, and others of similar merit, will always be entitled to our veneration, but the benefits which they conferred on their fellows were of a temporary or local nature: whereas the writings of Paine were intended for, and are applicable to the amelioration of the universe. The calumny heaped upon his memory, by the inveterate rancour of an alarmed aristocracy, and a relentless theocracy, evinces the keenness of the wounds he has inflicted on the systems. Let us hope that, e'er long, the "Age of Reason" will conduct us into the road to the "Rights of Man," and teach us to secure them when obtained. My best wishes to the undaunted martyrs in the glorious cause, by the efforts of whom the principles you and I admire, and profess, have been spread with so much success, but which is yet infinitely below their deserts. Be it our endeavour as it is our duty to lend the brave Carlile a hand in disseminating the important doctrines of morality, Materialism, and Republicanism.

I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

SQUIRE FARRAR.

After the reading of the above letter, a subscription was proposed and made as follows:

SUBSCRIPTIONS, RECEIVED JANUARY 29, 1824, IN HONOUR
OF PAINE'S BIRTH-DAY, BY JOHN SMITHSON.

David Ramsden	1 0	John Perkin	0 6
Squire Farrar, Otley	2 6	John Smith	0 6
John Smithson, towards a mental, rather than a sen- timental gratification	2 6	William Varey	1 6
Nathaniel Bain	1 0	William Collinson	0 6
T. T., a Friend	1 0	Benjamin Priestley	1 0
Samuel Ingham	1 0	John Buckley	1 0
George Sheard	1 0	Daniel Mellord	0 6
Isaac Robinson	1 6	Richard Varey	1 0
Forget thee! no! Thomas Evans	1 0	John Dovener	0 6
James Warburton	2 6	Alender Roberton	1 0
William Dunwel	0 6	One who wishes to see the remaining manuscripts of Thomas Paine published	1 0
J. Kidd, Kippax	1 0	Joshua Eastwood	1 6
Joseph Mitchell, Swillington	0 6	John Hewson	1 0
William Hanson, Preston	0 6	A speedy Reformation to all villainous and hypocritical Methodists	1 0
James Mann	2 6	Half a Crown that the Pigs lost, as they ran headlong into the Sea, found and preserved by James Smith of Skipton	2 6
James Longbottom	2 0		
Christ riding upon his stolen ass into Jerusalem	0 6		
R. W. Byerley, an animal of circumstances	2 6		

The memory of Brissot was then given, after which John Smithson addressed the meeting as follows:—

Mr. President and fellow Citizens,

It would ill become me to attempt to eulogize the character of the man whose natal day we are met to celebrate; a man whose writings on Government stand unparalleled in the annals of literature; and after the very able speech you have just heard from citizen Crowther, on the principles of Materialism, which I have openly avowed ever since 1818; it would ill become my vulgar tongue to occupy your time by an attempt to echo the same sentiment. If there be any individuals in this room who consider it necessary to the well being of man (either individually or collectively) to adopt any system of theology, I will give them this plain axiom to reflect upon, I will tell them, THAT A GOOD MAN STANDS IN NO NEED OF RELIGION; AND A BAD ONE OUGHT NOT TO COVER HIS ENORMITIES WITH IT, AS WITH A CLOAK. I would not wish any one to behave uncivilly to such individuals; I would be thankful for their company; and listen with attention to their arguments, so long as their object appeared to be the suppression of error, and the developement of truth; for, I hold that the

whole duty of man is to teach what useful knowledge he knows, and learn all he can; that this was the object of the immortal Paine, cannot be honestly denied, this idea is breathed through the whole of his writings, and was truly illustrated by the actions of his life; how far he succeeded in establishing this principle, let the example of America answer. Then let the advocates of theological systems demonstrate the utility of religion, or cease to condemn the disciples of morality without religion, for neglecting their mummeries, and rejecting their dogmas, as the greatest curse entailed upon society, and in no way useful or beneficial to any but their priests. It was against the mummeries of religion and in favour of Republican governments, that Paine's attention was particularly directed, rather than at the root of religion itself; but we are not to stop here nor there, at this man's opinion, nor at that man's opinion; the dissemination of knowledge, to a liberal and enlightened character, is always a pleasant task; as we become teachers and scholars at the same time; for mark me, that man knows but little, who thinks he has already learned enough, or that he can ever learn enough.

As it respects society governing itself without the aid of either kings or priests, I am of opinion, that a society is always capable of doing its own business; if it only knew what to do. The people, as a whole, are always open to conviction in every thing where their individual interests are concerned. The only difficulty is in coming at their ears. Consequently, to teach society its duty must be a work of time; and to be capable of doing it requires more reflection and experience, than men in general have patience to acquire. In some cases we are apt to be led away by the opinions of others instead of examining for ourselves; in other cases, custom, that tyrant of the universe, prevails on us to leave the darling prejudices undisturbed; and even if we take courage and commence the attack, if we do not take precaution and be prepared for the worst, we are then liable to be plunged over head and ears into that abyss, to which anticipation, the mother of disappointment, too frequently leads us. Then let us be cool, steady, and determined, and let each man go to the work of universal emancipation, as if all depended upon himself. It is the individual emancipation of the mind of man from error, *and that alone*, that can lead to national emancipation, and from that to the emancipation of the world. Then let us not be ashamed to either acknowledge our own errors, or to correct those we see in each other. Citizen Crowther has very properly urged the necessity of obtaining "correct ideas;" but in order to do this effectually, we must have such an alteration in the vocabulary, the spelling, and the pronunciation, as will make our language intelligible to each other. At present, we have a large book given to us, called a "pronouncing dictionary," as big as the bible, and about as full of contradictions; and what in the name of common

sense is this book for? Well, one of its uses is to tell us that our forefathers spelt their words one way and pronounced them another; and what is most astonishing, is, that the professed object of the book is to bequeath this error to posterity, in order to perpetuate the idea, that no man is capable of knowing the meaning of words, except he has been brought up in idleness at the University, and worth a certain sum of money, according to the same perversion of law, which says, *that no man is strong enough to carry a gun, except he be worth a hundred a year.* Now, how did it happen that these "Dictionary" makers could tell exactly what letters were necessary to give the words a proper sound, that they did not urge the necessity, and adopt the practice of spelling the words according to the pronunciation? Instead of so many years being required to teach a child to read and spell properly, would not three fourths of the time be better employed in learning chemistry, mineralogy, or any other useful science. Again, if we examine the explanations given to a number of words in common use, we shall find that we can neither come at "correct ideas," by the words or their pretended explanations, nor can we come at proper sounds by the spelling. Still, the incorrigible Tyrant, custom, has so woven them into the language, that even Mr. Carlyle himself, a man who has taken as much pains to acquire and disseminate knowledge as any man living ever did, is still in the habit of making use of words to which even "Dictionary" makers themselves, have not attached a proper meaning. In the Republican of July 11, 1823, page 15, he says, "scepticism and Atheism, which are one and the same thing, is the only real proof that the mind is sane and free from disease." In page 17 he speaks of a "true sceptic" in as much confidence as if the word had a proper meaning; when the fact is, that the word has never been defined by any of the "Dictionary" makers, or any of the word manufacturers, either in or out of Parliament. If we try the word "sceptic" by Walker's "Dictionary," we are told to "see skeptic." This is neither more nor less than saying, there are two words manufactured where one would have been sufficient; and if this had been the only blunder, it might have been overlooked; but, when we look for the word "skeptic," we are astonished, that such contradictions could have passed for explanations so long; the answer is "one who doubts, or pretends to doubt of every thing." Now, this is either saying, that the word "skeptic" has two opposite meanings, or that a man can be a confessed hypocrite and a conscientious person at the same time. To say no more of the absurdity of this pretended explanation, let us see to whom it will apply. Did you ever hear of a man who doubted or pretended "to doubt of every thing?" Does any one doubt, whether two and two make four, according to the common rules of arithmetic? Then why should the advocates of improvement stick at any particular system, and as it were, say unto science: "hitherto

shalt thou go, and no further?" Why not labour to make the language as definite, and the meaning of words as positive as any rule in Arithmetic? It is of no use to tell me, that this is not the proper time, or the proper place, or that I am as unfit for the task, as those who have preceded me; I shall simply answer, that it is always a right time to do good, and always a wrong time to do evil; and as to fitness, I am prepared for all the sneers of Latin scholars, alias, "*learned*" dunces in the community; for, I will readily acknowledge that I have no pretensions to a capability to handle this subject and treat upon it properly, in all its bearings. I wish either to teach or to be taught; and when I consider the seas of human blood that have been spilt, in former ages, through the misconstruction or misapplication of a single word or sentence in a state document; and when I think of the useless cavils that misconstructions generally lead to, I feel it my duty to throw out the hint for abler heads to improve upon.

I begin to fear, that I shall exhaust your patience, but before I sit down, there is one subject alluded to in Mr. Farrar's letter, that I wish to call your attention to: (cries of go on, go on) He states something in his letter concerning the "Age of Reason," conducting "us into the road to the Rights of Man," and teaching "us to secure them when obtained;" this is all very good, but as a friend of mine once said "*how are we to come at it?*" I trust you will give me credit when I state, that I do not mean any thing in disparagement of the ably written article, I have been and am going to refer to; it is Mr. Carlyle's comment upon "Major Cartwright's Constitution produced and illustrated." I have chosen it because I consider it a good article, to show, that, in the best articles of the best authors, there is still room for much improvement. I shall say nothing of Major Cartwright, but, that I am of opinion when he first saw that the people of England were in the dark, he furnished them with the best light he could find; but unfortunately, his lamp does not burn quite bright enough for the travellers of the present day. As to his "constitution," I should have thought if it had been worth any thing, it would have "illustrated" itself in a different manner; however, all the constitutions in the world, if there ever were any in the world, are nothing to me, or to society; the LIVING GENERATION, and no other, is competent to decide upon every thing connected with either the word law, or the word Constitution; and it is almost useless to talk of either till we have found out, or established a rule, by which we can understand what the words mean. The word *Constitution*, in my opinion, ought not to embrace any thing, but simply the mode in which the people are to elect their President and representatives, describe who are qualified, by their age, and the time of their residence, to hold such offices, and the rules for their conduct, their impeachment, disqualification, or punishment in cases of misconduct.

To which there should be added this saving clause, that nothing in this constitution, nor any thing in the code of laws annexed to it, be considered legal for longer than eight years from the time of its ratification. That a national convention be called at the end of seven years from the date hereof, to be elected by districts, each district to contain, as near as possible, an equal number of men, and one man to be elected as the conventional member of that district. That the number of conventional members be at least ten times the number of the yearly representatives. That they meet in a large amphitheatre, to be fitted up for the purpose of deliberation, and that they proceed to re- enact, amend, or alter any thing in the constitution and annexed code of laws, to meet the wishes of a majority of the living generation, their employers or constituents. That their deliberations be conducted after this manner: a third part of the conventional members to be balloted from the remainder, and to form a *subconvention for observation*; and that half of the remaining two thirds be balloted to form another subconvention for observation. That the subconventions be seated in two separate galleries, one each side of the building: (you remember the old story "that lookers on can best tell who misses their game," and game I would have here) these two companies to sit and hear the deliberations of the remainder and change places alternately, till each third part had gone carefully through the whole of the articles considered necessary for government for the next seven years; after that, the whole body to form one company and draw up and agree to one constitution, and one only. That the same should be immediately printed, and sent by each member to the different districts, requesting them to meet, examine it, and to send their instructions as to what alterations, if any, were wished, previous to its final ratification. That the members should there conclude what was to be the code and constitution after having received the advice of the different districts.

This, in my opinion, would be something like a rational course of proceeding*, at least it would be better than to have a Milton and a Fitzwilliam to speak in favour of the people, and to send

* Citizen Smithson—This would be confusion confused. You are a clever fellow; but you have added no light by your constitution lamp. Every piece of law is a piece of the constitution, and the constitution as a whole is but another term for *the law*, or *the laws*. We want laws—we want magistrates to execute them, and that is all we want. Law is a compact between the people for the observance of a rule. Your scheme must have the sanction of an assembly of the representatives of the people, before it could be acted upon; and then it would be but a law; and, as such, only a piece of a constitution. Any man who sets up as a constitution-monger, in such a country as this, at this time, is a blind politician. All that is necessary, is to remove existing error in the mode of making and executing the laws.

R. C.

men for their own borough to vote with the minister of the day. This, in my opinion, would be doing something towards "securing our rights when they were obtained;" and without this we might as well never obtain them; for, unless the people knew the use of them, and kept them in constant practice, they would sink into a state of lethargy, and suffer themselves to be again taken advantage of. Mr. Carlile says, in the twenty-first page of the before mentioned article, something of the "constitution being changed by every new assembly of representatives;" I say, if he means by representatives, the conventional members, I agree with him*, but if he alludes to the yearly representatives, I do not agree with him; and here we see the necessity of understanding the words we make use of. I hold, that the parliament has nothing to do with altering the laws by which it has been elected; and that it ought not to alter any law without giving it publicity in the shape they would have it, and if a majority of the conventional districts met and sent their objection to it, it should not be altered without waiting for the decision of a national convention†.

This, my friends and fellow citizens, is a rough abstract of what I consider to be necessary to place the sovereignty in the hands of THE RIGHTFUL SOVEREIGN—THE PEOPLE. But I am not to dictate to the people, my business and duty is to recommend what I consider would be for the best, and to defend that, till something better is produced. Our object ought to be the establishment of the purest representative system of government that can possibly be devised, and above all things, never to forget Citizen Farrar's advice, "SECURE WHAT WE OBTAIN." Let it be known to each representative, that all power will revolve back upon the people at the end of every seven years, and that his conduct will be condemned or admired in proportion as he has endeavoured to promote the happiness of mankind. This you will say is supposing the people to have wisdom enough to understand, and courage enough to defend their own rights, I admit it; the supposition is correct; and I boldly affirm, without fear of successful contradiction, that we have no hopes of any great and favourable change taking place in the Government, but by the dissemination of knowledge on these subjects. And until we can establish FREE DISCUSSION in its fullest extent, both through the press and every other means, we shall be unequal to the task; for, it is an incontrovertible maxim, that an ignorant, besotted people, will never have a moral or an honest Government, and that an enlightened and moral people will not long submit to an immoral or dishonest Govern-

* I say that your Conventional members are not necessary; and that the yearly elected representatives are equal to every thing that is necessary.

† The people would find time for nothing else, if this were the case.

R. C.

ment. To tell you, in plain language, the root of all the evil is in the ignorance of the people. What can the best servant in the world do, but his own way, when his employer is either *ignorant or besotted* enough to leave him to his own discretion; and how can we expect that from a Government, which we do not look for in an individual? How can we expect other people to be honest to us, when we are neither honest to ourselves, nor to one another? Paine justly observes, that "*one ounce of common sense is worth a ton of memory,*" and he might have gone further; he might have said, *that a grain of honesty is worth more than a ton of each of the others put together without it.* It is nothing but the treachery and dishonesty of pretenders in all ages, that have brought the best men to the scaffold, or if they escaped with their lives, they have in many cases become secluded misanthropes, seeing that the only means to *escape the ingratitude, is to shun the society of man.* Are we not daily in the habit of witnessing this species of conduct carried on in every possible shape? How then can we expect honesty in a Government, when the men who are loudest in their condemnation of abuses, are the first to treat with ingratitude (that blackest crime on earth) the very men whose welfare they had pretended to have so much at heart? when the men who are ready to ask an alms one day will rob their benefactor the next? In fact, what can we expect, or what do we deserve, but to be robbed, plundered, and betrayed, while we rob, plunder, and betray one another? Nay, do not startle at the language! There is no language strong enough to describe the feelings, to pourtray the anxieties and inquietudes of men, whose only crime has been their good intentions, and whose only failing has been their readiness to believe others were equally sincere. Let any man, who has noticed the fate of the real friends of the people in this, or in any other country, say if the picture be too highly coloured. I say it is not; it cannot be high enough coloured, till it abate the nuisance complained of: and that, I fear, will not be so easily accomplished. Before I conclude, I will just repeat a short paragraph from "Junius' Letters," which is applicable to this subject. The writer says: "*singular as my present situation is, it is neither painful, nor was it unforeseen. He is not fit for public business, who does not, even at his entrance, prepare his mind for such an event. Health, fortune, tranquillity, and private connections, I have sacrificed upon the altar of the public; and the only consolation I have received, because I will not concur to dupe and mislead a senseless multitude, is barely, THAT THEY HAVE NOT YET TORN ME IN PIECES.* That this has been the only return is my pride, and a source of more real satisfaction than honours or prosperity. I can practise before I am old, the lessons I learned in my youth."

I will now leave you to say whether there is one man in a thou-

sand, who has taken any part in public affairs, from honest motives, that this will not apply to.

But we must not be intimidated, nor awed into silence on this account; perseverance and a good cause, are the certain harbingers of success. The principles of PAINE are solid. They will remain the same, if ninety-nine out of every hundred who advocate them should turn apostates. The man who stands upon these principles may die, but he can never fall. What I particularly wish is, that every man who professes to admire and defend these principles, should ask himself, whether he intends, as far as lays in his power, to practise them or not: for, without practice, all the theories in the world are of little use. Junius says, "*A clear unblemished character comprehends not only the integrity that will not offer, but the spirit that will not submit to an injury; and whether it belongs to an individual, or to a community; it is the foundation of peace, of independence, and of safety. Private credit is wealth; public honor is security.*" Then I conjure the advocates of the principles of PAINE, to do all in their power to avoid practising themselves, what they condemn in others. He concluded by proposing a toast to the memory of Baron Holback, author of "Letters to Eugenia."

The memory of Elihu Palmer.

John Smithson read a placard announcing the delivery of some lectures on electricity, galvanism, magnetism, the properties of the air pump, &c., recommending the company to examine these matters closely for themselves, as nothing in his opinion had a greater tendency to remove prejudice, and establish correct ideas than a knowledge of the nature and properties of matter. Mr. Byerley spoke at a considerable length on the gratification he had received by attending these lectures. There were some objections raised to this subject as irrelevant to the object of the meeting. The answer made to the objections was, that "no man could argue with any degree of confidence on the principles of Materialism, or ever be said to understand them without a knowledge of the sciences in question," and "that those who objected to this as irrelevant to the business of the meeting, must, in order to be consistent with themselves, go home and tear out of Paine's political writings every leaf that had any thing upon it, concerning either cast iron bridges, or any other science, but Government; it was a fact that the very men who affected to despise his principles, adopted and admired his plans."

The memory of Volney, author of "The Ruins of Empires."

The memory of Messrs. Franklin and Priestly.

The memory of the brave Riego.

Many Songs were sung, and the meeting concluded, apparently as well satisfied as if a mental feast had been accompanied with a sensual gratification.

TO SPANIARDS.

Shame on ye Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
No longer vaunt of your Castilian name:

Shame on ye Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
To crouch to the gaul of Holy Ghost fame.

Shame on ye Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
Ruled by a priest—a Bourbon by name:
A maker of petticoats—a murderer vile,
A coward—a cut-purse—a compound of guile.

Shame on ye Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
The butt of all nations—the world's make-game:

Shame on ye Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
Than asses more dull, than asses more tame.

To witness the monks and panders to power,
Such dastardly insults on Riego shower;

To look on the basket—to look on the man,

To look on the garb the Hero had on—

Oh! SPANIARD! Spaniard! Shame, Oh! shame,
Fall'n's thy spirit—fall'n's thy fame.

Why did ye tamely behold the parade
Of Riego the good—so cruelly made?

Why were your swords not flesh'd to the hilt

In that basest of Bourbons—that wretch who has spilt
The best—the purest of patriot blood,

Murder'd the man who knew nothing but good?

Why, why did your swords not bitterly weep

Tears of blood for the deadly sleep,

The murder'd Riego doth coldly keep?

Oh! Spaniards! Spaniards!—Shame, Oh! shame,
No longer the brave—no longer the same

High minded—just—generous—race,

Who ne'er brook'd affront—who ne'er brooked disgrace.

Beheld ye the monk whose leaden weight*

Hung deadly round the fall'n great?

* Tis said that the last convulsive throes of poor Riego were subdued by a lusty monk running voluntarily from the crowd, and pulling the dying man by the legs: I dare say, that the pious will think, that the Reverend gentleman, was cruel only to be kind; from such kindness, all that is good defend us.

Beheld ye the hangman jump on his frame;
 Heard ye the Frank* cry “*Shame, Oh! Shame?*”
 Beheld ye his tongue all swell’n—black;
 Beheld ye his eyes,—did ye start back?
 To see the reproach that was fixed there,
 Mingled with anguish—with mute despair?

Or, saw ye his wife, as ye went to your homes,
 With hair dishevell’d—as the maniac roams;
 The salt tears trickling down her grief-worn cheek,
 Her gentle heart rent—unable to speak—
 Did your eyes meet hers as ye pass’d along,
 Did you see nothing *there* to say who acted wrong;
 Did no accusation flash from her eye,
 Nothing that said, “should Riego die
 For cowards—for slaves—for wretches like you,
The meanest of men that Spain ever knew?”

Had he *children*? then they must greet ye well,
 Their little tongues hereafter will tell
 How nobly you’ve done in their father’s cause,
 How bravely ye fought in your *country’s cause*.
 How grand your defence of national laws,
 Oh! Spaniards! Spaniards! Shame, Oh! shame,
 Wrung be your hearts at Riego’s name.

BRIAN BORHOIME.

* “And the executioner jumped on his shoulders holding by the rope by which he was suspended, frequently rising up, and then forcing himself down on his victim — a French officer in my room called out, ‘shame, shame,’ and retired.” See the details of the *murder* of Riego, given by Sir Paul Baggot at Madrid, in the Republican, vol. 9, page 25.

FOURTH SUBSCRIPTION FROM LIVERPOOL.

Collected by Thomas Lindsey.

James Lilly	1	0	0	Thomas Smith	0	10	6
Thomas Lindsey	1	0	0	Thomas Lee	0	1	0
P. Jones	0	5	0	R. L.	0	1	0
John Davies	0	5	0	John Hale	0	2	6
R. R.	0	10	6	Mr. Stephenson	0	1	0
D. H.	1	0	0	Peter Mackintosh	0	2	6
P. W.	1	0	0	A Friend	0	10	0
R. S.	0	10	0	Mr. Hurd, and wishes it	0	1	0
John Blore	0	5	0	were Five Pounds	0	1	0

Collected by Richard Cawkwell.

Richard Cawkwell	1	1	0	vocated Free Discus-
North Star	0	5	0	sion upon all subjects
J. H.	0	5	0	R. C.
W. A., a Catholic, to enable R. Carlile to pay his fines for having ad-				T. Smith's 2d subscription
				0 2 6

Collected by John Crellan.

John Crellan	0	10	6	Hugh Shields	0	0	6
Thomas Jones	0	10	6	S. L.	0	1	0
A Friend	0	2	6	H. P.	0	5	0
William Gray	0	1	0	R. H.	0	1	0
J. S. Hallowes	0	2	6	A Friend	0	1	0
James Harrison	0	1	0	Ditto	0	5	0
Andrew Horde	0	1	0	Ditto	0	2	6
A Friend	0	2	6	Ditto	0	2	0
John Hilliard	0	10	6	J. Hornby	0	2	6
John Brighouse	0	2	0	A Friend to Freedom	0	5	0
Charles Murray	0	2	6	Lieut. Wynne, R. C. M.,			
Smith Rowland	0	1	0	an Enemy to dastard-			
Daniel Crear	0	1	0	ly revenge	0	5	0
William Sims	0	1	0	An inveterate Enemy to			
Captain Thomson of the Express	0	2	6	oppression	0	5	0
A Friend	0	1	0	James M'Gahey	0	2	0
Captain Lloyd of the St. Patrick	0	1	0	J. P.	0	2	6
Mr. Hewit	0	2	0	R. M.	0	0	6
A Friend	0	2	0	John Holden	0	1	0
				Luke Robut	0	1	0

Erratum.—In page 259 of this No. second line from the bottom, for Tailmin's read Toulmin's.